

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 18-20, 22-31 are amended. Claims 1, 18, 19, 24, 26-31 are amended to recite features supported in the specification at, for example, page 52, line 4 – page 53, line 18 and Fig. 8. Claims 20, 22 and 23 are amended to recite features supported in the specification at, for example, page 48, line 24 – page 50, line 5 and Fig. 7. Claims 5 and 25 are amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Amendment Entry After Final Rejection

Entry of this amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance for all the reasons discussed herein; b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration; c) place the application in better condition for appeal if necessary; and d) address formal requirements of the Final Rejection and preceding Office Action. The foregoing amendments do not raise any new issues after Final Rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

II. The Claims Satisfy All Formal Requirements

The Final Office Action objects to claim 5 based on informalities. Claim 5 has been amended to obviate the objection, and specifically to change claim dependency from cancelled claim 4 to claim 1. Withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

III. Claims 1, 3 and 5-34 Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 5-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0065709 to MacKenzie in view of U.S. Patent 6,070,143 to Barney *et al.* (Barney) and U.S. Patent 6,606,615 to Jennings *et al.* (Jennings). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

MacKenzie, Barney and Jennings, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a knowledge-based management diagnosis method, comprising collecting and accumulating awareness data from a plurality of subjects in an organization, the awareness data expressing knowledge assets and feature assets about actions; and analyzing the accumulated awareness data, and outputting results of the analysis to a presentation side terminal through a communication link, wherein the feature assets relate to work styles of each subject, the work styles including an autonomy range and an interaction range, the autonomy range extending between routine and creative work, the interaction range extending between inside office and outside office personal interaction, and wherein the knowledge assets are temporal knowledge assets, the temporal knowledge assets indicating how the knowledge assets will change from present to a future time, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in apparatus and program product claims 18 and 19, respectively.

Also, MacKenzie, Barney and Jennings, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a knowledge-based management diagnosis method, comprising displaying a plurality of knowledge items which include at least an item relating to empirical knowledge and an item relating to standardized knowledge; accumulating as first awareness data knowledge items input as being presently important to an organization by a plurality of subjects belonging to the organization and determining as results for the first awareness data the number of inputs for each knowledge item input as being presently important, and also accumulating as second awareness data knowledge items input by the plurality of subjects as becoming important for the organization in the future and determining as results for the second awareness data the number of inputs for each knowledge item input as becoming important; and comparing results determined for the first awareness data and the second awareness data, the compared results including a shift direction between a present importance and a future importance, and displaying the compared result in association with the respective

knowledge items, including the shift between the present and future importance, as recited in claim 20, and similarly recited in claims 22 and 23.

Also, MacKenzie, Barney and Jennings, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a knowledge-based management diagnosis method, comprising displaying a plurality of knowledge items which include at least an item relating to empirical knowledge and an item relating to standardized knowledge; accumulating as first awareness data knowledge items input by a plurality of subjects as being presently important for an organization to which the subjects belong, and determining the number of inputs for each knowledge item input as presently important, and also accumulating as second awareness data knowledge items input by the plurality of subjects as becoming important for the organization in the future and determining the number of inputs for each knowledge item input becoming important; accumulating as third awareness data, information pertaining to the degree of contribution of each subject to the plurality of knowledge items as input by the plurality of subjects; the degree of contribution including a working autonomy range and an interaction range, the working autonomy range extending between routine and creative work, the interaction range extending between inside office and outside office personal interaction, and specifying the subjects who have input the data pertaining to the degree of contribution for at least one knowledge item, as recited in claim 24, and similarly recited in claims 26 and 27.

In addition, MacKenzie, Barney and Jennings, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a knowledge-based management diagnosis method, comprising displaying a plurality of knowledge items that include at least an item relating to empirical knowledge and an item relating to standardized knowledge; accumulating as first awareness data knowledge items input by a plurality of subjects as being presently important for an organization to which the subjects belong, and determining as results the number of the inputs for each knowledge item input as presently important, and also accumulating as second awareness data

knowledge items input by the plurality of subjects as becoming important for the organization in the future, and determining as results the number of inputs for each knowledge item input as becoming important; and comparing results determined for the first awareness data and results determined for the second awareness data, classifying the organization into one of a plurality of categories based upon the comparison results, and outputting the classification result, the classified categories including a nomad, an analyst, an agent and a keeper, the nomad corresponding to high autonomy and high interaction, the analyst corresponding to high autonomy and low interaction, the agent corresponding to low autonomy and high interaction, and the keeper corresponding to low autonomy and low interaction, as recited in claim 28, and similarly recited in claims 29 and 30.

MacKenzie, Barney and Jennings, alone or in combination, also do not teach or suggest a knowledge-based management diagnosis method, comprising collecting and accumulating awareness data from a plurality of subjects in an organization, the awareness data expressing at least knowledge assets and feature assets about actions; analyzing the accumulated awareness data, and outputting results of the analysis to a presentation side terminal through a communication link; and generating at least one community of subjects whose work styles are similar based on the results of the analysis, wherein the work styles include an autonomy range and an interaction range, the autonomy range extending between routine and creative work, the interaction range extending between inside office and outside office personal interaction, as recited in claim 31.

Instead, MacKenzie discloses a system for analyzing employee opinion survey (EOS) results. In particular, MacKenzie teaches EOS results using independent variables called “knobs” from correlations with Organizational Diagnostic Survey (ODS) holonomic properties. The ODS items are analyzed to determine effects on EOS results (paragraphs [0006], [0018], [0056], [0057], [0064] and Fig. 1 of MacKenzie). However, Applicants

assert that MacKenzie fails to teach or suggest autonomy and interaction ranges, or a shift direction between present and future importance, as recited in Applicants' claimed features

Barney does not compensate for the deficiencies of MacKenzie. Instead, Barney discloses a method for analyzing work requirements. In particular, Barney teaches categorizing jobs by title and corresponding skills (col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 12 and Figs. 7-9 of Barney). Nonetheless, Barney fails to teach or suggest autonomy and interaction ranges regarding work styles.

Jennings also does not compensate for the deficiencies of MacKenzie. Instead, Jennings discloses forecasting parameters based on previous statistical trends. In particular, Jennings teaches a graph 50 to predict stock value (col. 26, lines 6-19 and Fig. 5A of Jennings). However, Jennings fails to teach or suggest a shift direction between present and future importance for awareness data.

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the survey variables of MacKenzie with the job categorization of Barney and the forecast graph of Jennings, nor has the Final Office Action established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed features.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness for a §103 rejection requires satisfaction of three basic criteria: there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the references or combine reference teachings, a reasonable expectation of success, and the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §706.02(j)). Applicants assert that the Final Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with MacKenzie, Barney and Jennings.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims are patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over

the applied references for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

Date: September 16, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--